

### **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed October 8, 2010; and the Advisory Action mailed November 18, 2010.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13, 16-20 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kampe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,854,069 hereinafter Kampe).

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12, 17, 18 and 31-37; cancel Claims 6, 17 and 33; and adds Claims 38 and 39, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 16, 18-20, 31, 32 and 34-39.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to comply with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13, 16-20 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kampe.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

1. *A system for high availability clustering of a group of computer nodes, comprising:  
a plurality of computers interconnected to create a cluster network, each computer including a software cluster server and a plurality of resources of multiple resource types,*

*wherein each resource of the plurality of resources are grouped in a resource group according to resource type, and*  
*wherein each software cluster server provides an application access to the plurality of resources on one of the plurality of computers;*  
*a remote resource interface at each of the plurality of computers provided by the software cluster server, the remote resource interface including a plurality of plug-ins that are plugged into the remote resource interface, wherein each plug-in includes one or more methods calls that operate on the plurality of resources, is specific to a particular resource type, and is loaded at a time when one of the plurality of resources of the particular resource type is created,*  
*wherein a handle for each created resource type is returned by the plug-in for that resource type, and is used to invoke the one or more methods calls; and*  
*wherein the remote resource interface isolates the software cluster server from resource-specific operations of each plug-in while providing access to the plurality of resources.*

Kampe discloses a method and system for achieving high availability in a networked computer system. (Abstract). As disclosed therein, the networked computer system includes nodes that are connected by a network. (Column 2, lines 29-30). The components represent or correspond to hardware or software in the networked computer system and are high-availability aware. (Column 2, lines 32-34). The software architecture can be viewed in terms of six areas: availability management, external management, component integration services, distributed system services, platform specific services and underlying operating system. (Column 2, lines 31-35). The distributed systems services may be used to enable applications to be spread throughout a networked computer system or a cluster of computers. (Column 5, lines 56-58).

In the Office Action, it was asserted that Kampe discloses that each computer includes a software cluster server, a cluster database, and a set of resources of multiple resource types, including software application servers, wherein each software cluster server operating at one of the one or more of the computers provides an application access to the set of resources on said computer, or at another one of the one or more computers interconnected to the cluster network. It was further asserted that Kampe discloses that the resource interface accepts additional plugins that are plugged into the resource interface to provide application-specific callbacks from the software cluster to other resource types.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite a plug-in that includes one or more methods calls that operate on a plurality of resources, is specific to a particular resource type, and is loaded at a time when one of the plurality of resources of the particular resource type is created.

Applicant respectfully submits that based on the above description, Kampe instead appears to disclose the use of plug-ins to provide standard management and service methods (e.g., device drivers, protocols, applications) to facilitate the addition of new components to a system. Further, although Kampe discloses plug-ins to add new components to a system, Applicant respectfully submits that Kampe does not disclose that a handle for each created resource type is returned by the plug-in for that resource type, and is used to invoke the one or more methods calls, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the remote resource interface isolates the software cluster server from resource-specific operations of each plug-in while providing access to the plurality of resources. As recited in paragraph [0080] of the specification, this feature is desirable in a high availability framework since the functioning of the Cluster Server will not be affected by programmatic errors of plug-in, thereby allowing applications to continue to access resources if a plug-in fails. Applicant submits that Kampe does not disclose this feature.

In view of these comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kampe. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 12 and 31**

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 12 and 31 have been amended to recite features similar to those described above with respect to Claim 1. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 12 and 31 as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kampe. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2, 5-9, 13, 16-20 and 32-37**

Claims 6, 17 and 33 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the rejection to those claims. Claims 2, 5, 7-9, 13, 16, 18-20, 32, 34-37 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 12 or 31. These claims are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2011

By: /Adam T. Hipp/  
Adam T. Hipp  
Reg. No. 60,344

Customer No. 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928